The Missing Gavel: Why the Ottoman Magna Carta Failed

A Comparative Study of Constitutional Emergence in England (1215) and the Ottoman Empire (1808)

Thomas J. Bryan, Claude/Anthropic

Part I: The Same Machine, Different Containers

Introduction: The Lock That Didn't Click

In 1808, the Ottoman Empire produced a document almost indistinguishable from Magna Carta. The **Sened-i Ittifak** ("Deed of Agreement") emerged from identical conditions: a weak ruler, powerful provincial lords, fiscal crisis, and military threat. The document contained the same core provisions: limits on royal taxation, guarantees of noble property, requirements for consultation before major decisions.

Yet the outcomes could not have been more different.

In England, Magna Carta—despite being annulled within months—established a principle that would be revived, reconfirmed, and eventually transformed into parliamentary democracy. The barons' self-defense mechanism became the foundation of constitutional government.

In the Ottoman Empire, the Sened-i Ittifak lasted less than a generation. Sultan Mahmud II systematically destroyed the provincial lords who had forced him to sign it, confiscated their property, executed their leaders, and established an absolutism more complete than anything before. The nobles' self-defense mechanism became the prelude to their annihilation.

Why did the same mechanism produce opposite results?

The answer lies not in the personalities of kings or the courage of nobles, but in what we might call the **legal container**—the underlying framework of law within which political struggles occur. In England, law was human-made, customary, and owned by those who administered it. In the

Ottoman Empire, law was divine, eternal, and monopolized by religious scholars who had no interest in baronial liberty.

The elite self-defense mechanism requires not just motivation (threatened wealth) and capacity (military or political leverage) but also **legal infrastructure**—a conception of law that permits nobles to become legislators. Where that infrastructure exists, constitutional government can emerge. Where it doesn't, even successful baronial revolts lead only to temporary truces before royal counter-attack.

This is the story of the missing gavel—the legislative authority that English barons claimed and Ottoman Ayans could never grasp.

Chapter 1: The Bankruptcy Machine (Ottoman Version)

The Empire in Crisis

By 1800, the Ottoman Empire was dying—slowly, unevenly, but unmistakably. The "Sick Man of Europe" had been losing territory for over a century: Hungary to the Habsburgs, the Black Sea coast to Russia, Egypt effectively independent under Mamluk beys. The Balkan provinces seethed with nationalist stirrings. The treasury was empty.

The crisis was structural, not merely military. The traditional Ottoman land system—the **timar**—had broken down. Under this system, cavalrymen (sipahis) received land grants in exchange for military service. They did not own the land; they held it conditionally, and it reverted to the state upon death or failure of service. This prevented the emergence of a hereditary landed aristocracy.

But by the 18th century, the timar system had collapsed. The sipahi cavalry was obsolete against European infantry and artillery. The land grants had been converted into tax farms—the right to collect taxes from a region, purchased from the state. And these tax farms had become, in practice, hereditary.

The men who held them were called **Ayans**—notables, provincial strongmen, local bosses. They collected taxes (keeping substantial portions), maintained private armies, administered justice in their territories, and passed their positions to their sons. In everything but legal theory, they were feudal lords.

The Ayans: Ottoman Barons

The Ayans were not a unified class. They ranged from small-town tax collectors to territorial magnates controlling entire provinces. The most powerful commanded thousands of armed men and ruled territories larger than European kingdoms.

Consider **Alemdar Mustafa Pasha**, the Ayan of Rousse (in modern Bulgaria). By 1808, he controlled much of the Danubian region, commanded an army of 40,000, and was effectively independent of Istanbul. He paid nominal tribute to the Sultan but made his own foreign policy, negotiated directly with Russia, and administered his territory as a personal domain.

Or **Ali Pasha of Ioannina**, who ruled much of Albania and northwestern Greece for decades. His court at Ioannina was a rival center of power; European travelers compared him to a medieval prince. He was nominally an Ottoman official but practically a sovereign.

These men were the Ottoman equivalents of the English barons who forced King John to sign Magna Carta. They had land (even if the legal title was ambiguous), they had armies, they had local legitimacy. And they were threatened by the same thing that had threatened English barons: a centralizing ruler who wanted their wealth.

Sultan Selim III and the New Order

Sultan Selim III (r. 1789-1807) recognized that the Empire needed modernization to survive. He launched the **Nizam-i Cedid** ("New Order")—a comprehensive reform program centered on creating a European-style army trained by French advisors, equipped with modern weapons, and funded by new taxes.

The problem: who would pay for this new army?

The traditional military forces—the Janissaries and the provincial sipahis—were useless against European armies but politically powerful. The Janissaries controlled Istanbul; the Ayans controlled the provinces. Both groups would be marginalized by the New Order. And both would be taxed to pay for their own obsolescence.

Selim's reforms threatened the Ayans directly:

New Taxes: The Nizam-i Cedid required new revenue. This meant either raising existing taxes (which the Ayans collected and skimmed) or imposing new taxes (which would be collected by new officials loyal to Istanbul).

Military Competition: The new army would eventually replace the Ayans' private forces as the guarantors of provincial order. The Ayans' political leverage depended on being necessary; a strong central army would make them dispensable.

Administrative Centralization: Selim sent inspectors to audit provincial finances, appointed officials to supervise local administration, and attempted to assert direct control over regions the Ayans considered their personal domains.

The Ayans responded as barons always respond to threatened extraction: they resisted, evaded, and eventually rebelled.

The Counter-Revolution of 1807

In May 1807, the Janissaries—allied with conservative religious scholars and threatened by the same reforms that threatened the Ayans—overthrew Selim III. The reformist Sultan was deposed and eventually murdered. His cousin Mustafa IV, a nonentity controlled by the rebels, was placed on the throne.

This might seem like victory for the anti-reform forces. But the Janissary coup created a power vacuum that the Ayans moved to fill.

Alemdar Mustafa Pasha saw opportunity. He had supported Selim III's reforms (which would have weakened the Janissaries, his rivals). Now he marched on Istanbul with his provincial army—not to destroy the sultanate but to control it.

In July 1808, Alemdar's forces entered the capital. Sultan Mustafa IV, attempting to prevent his replacement, ordered the murder of the deposed Selim III and the heir apparent, Prince Mahmud. Selim was killed, but Mahmud survived—hidden by a loyal servant.

Alemdar installed the young Mahmud II on the throne. The new Sultan was seventeen years old, traumatized by nearly being murdered, and entirely dependent on the Ayan warlord who had saved his life.

This was the moment of maximum Ayan leverage—the Ottoman equivalent of the barons' confrontation with King John at Runnymede.

Chapter 2: The Paper Shield

The Sened-i Ittifak

In September 1808, Alemdar Mustafa Pasha convened a conference of the major Ayans at Istanbul. The purpose: to negotiate a settlement between the provincial lords and the central government.

The document that emerged—the **Sened-i Ittifak** ("Deed of Agreement")—was explicitly modeled on European constitutional precedents. Ottoman officials were aware of Magna Carta and the English constitutional tradition. Some historians believe French advisors helped draft the document.

The Sened-i Ittifak contained these key provisions:

Recognition of Ayan Authority:

> "The Ayans of Rumelia [the Balkans] and Anatolia, who hold authority in their respective territories, are confirmed in their positions. Their lands and property shall be secure."

This guaranteed the Ayans' de facto power in law. They would not be dismissed at will, their lands would not be confiscated, their positions would be hereditary.

Limits on Central Taxation:

> "Taxes shall be collected according to established custom. No new taxes shall be imposed without consultation with the Ayans."

This was the Ottoman "no taxation without consent"—the same principle that appears in Magna Carta's Clause 12.

Consultation Requirement:

> "Before matters of state are decided, the Grand Vizier shall consult with the assembled Ayans and consider their counsel."

This implied a consultative body—an assembly of notables who would advise (and implicitly constrain) the central government.

Mutual Defense:

> "The Ayans pledge to support the Sultanate against its enemies, foreign and domestic. The Sultanate pledges to protect the Ayans against unlawful attack."

This was a feudal bargain: military service in exchange for security. It implied that the Ayans had legitimate interests the Sultan was bound to respect.

Enforcement Mechanism:

> "Should either party violate this agreement, the other party is released from its obligations."

Like Magna Carta's Clause 61 (which authorized barons to seize royal property if John violated the charter), this created a theoretical mechanism for holding the ruler accountable.

What the Sened-i Ittifak Meant

Read literally, the Sened-i Ittifak created a **federal Ottoman monarchy**:

- The Sultan remained supreme sovereign, but his power was limited by law
- The Ayans were recognized as legitimate power-holders, not mere servants of the state
- Taxation required consent; major decisions required consultation
- The Ayans had collective standing to resist violations

This was precisely what the English barons had achieved at Runnymede. The document established principles—consent, consultation, property security—that, if institutionalized, could have developed into constitutional government.

Alemdar Mustafa Pasha clearly intended to institutionalize these principles. He planned to create a permanent consultative body—an assembly of Ayans who would meet regularly in Istanbul, advise the government, and check sultanic absolutism. This would have been an Ottoman Parliament.

The Witnesses

The Sened-i Ittifak was signed by Sultan Mahmud II (under duress), Grand Vizier Alemdar Mustafa Pasha, the Sheikh ul-Islam (chief religious authority), and representatives of the major Ayan families.

The presence of the Sheikh ul-Islam is significant. It meant the religious establishment had endorsed the document. This should have given it legitimacy within the Ottoman legal framework.

But notice who signed: the Sultan (coerced), the Grand Vizier (an Ayan himself), and religious and provincial notables. There was no institutional structure to enforce the agreement—no standing body with authority to interpret its provisions, no court with jurisdiction over violations, no mechanism for collective Ayan action.

The document was a contract between individuals, not a constitutional framework for government. When those individuals died or lost power, the contract would have no enforcers.

Chapter 3: Why the Lock Broke

The First Failure: Alemdar's Death

The Sened-i Ittifak survived exactly two months.

In November 1808, the Janissaries—who had been excluded from the settlement and saw it as a threat to their position—launched a counter-coup. They attacked Alemdar Mustafa Pasha's residence. Alemdar, surrounded and seeing no escape, ignited his own powder magazine, killing himself and hundreds of Janissaries in the explosion.

With Alemdar dead, the Sened-i Ittifak lost its enforcer. The Ayans had no mechanism for collective action. They retreated to their provinces. Sultan Mahmud II, still young but learning quickly, was left to navigate between the Janissaries (who had nearly killed him and had just killed his patron) and the Ayans (who had leverage but no organization).

The Theological Problem

Here is where the Ottoman case diverges fundamentally from the English case.

When the English barons forced King John to sign Magna Carta, they were operating within a legal tradition that recognized human legislation. English law was "Common Law"—the accumulated customs and precedents of the realm, interpreted by royal courts but shaped by usage. The barons were demanding that the king respect existing law and that future law be made with their consent.

Crucially, the English barons could become legislators. There was no theological barrier to a "House of Lords" creating new laws. Law was human; humans could make it.

The Ottoman Ayans faced a different legal landscape.

Ottoman law was divided into two categories:

Sharia (Islamic Divine Law): Based on the Quran, the Hadith (sayings of the Prophet), and centuries of jurisprudential interpretation. Sharia governed personal status (marriage, divorce, inheritance), commercial transactions, and criminal penalties. Only the **Ulema** (religious scholars) could interpret Sharia. The Sultan could not change it; no human legislature could modify divine commands.

Kanun (Sultanic Law): Administrative regulations issued by the Sultan covering matters not directly addressed by Sharia—taxation, land tenure, military organization, provincial administration. Kanun was subordinate to Sharia and could not contradict it, but within its sphere, the Sultan was the sole legislator.

The Sened-i Ittifak concerned itself primarily with Kanun—taxation, provincial administration, the relationship between center and periphery. The Ayans could theoretically constrain the Sultan's Kanun-making authority.

But they could not become legislators themselves. There was no Ottoman concept of a parliament—a body of nobles authorized to make law. In Islamic political theory, God is the only legislator. The Sultan's Kanun authority derived from necessity (someone had to administer the realm) and was always subordinate to divine law. A "House of Ayans" making laws would have been theologically incoherent.

The Ulema—the religious scholars who monopolized Sharia interpretation—had no interest in Ayan power. They were not landed nobles; they were a scholarly class recruited through education and patronage. Their power came from their monopoly on religious legitimacy, not from provincial estates. A constitutional settlement empowering the Ayans would have marginalized the Ulema.

The Persian Model

Ottoman political culture was heavily influenced by the **Sassanian Persian** tradition of statecraft, transmitted through the Abbasid Caliphate and refined by centuries of Islamic administration.

The Persian model envisioned government as a **circle of justice**:

> "The world is a garden; the state is its fence. The state is maintained by law. Law is preserved by the king. The king is upheld by the army. The army is supported by the treasury. The treasury is filled by the subjects. The subjects are protected by justice."

This circle has no place for a legislature. The king ensures justice; the subjects provide revenue; the relationship is vertical, not contractual. Nobles might advise the king, but they have no authority independent of him.

More crucially, the Persian tradition included the practice of **musadara**—the confiscation of a deceased or disgraced official's property by the state. An Ottoman vizier, no matter how wealthy, held his wealth at the Sultan's pleasure. Upon death or dismissal, his property would be "inventoried"—meaning seized. This was legal, expected, and universal.

This practice prevented the emergence of a stable noble class with inherited wealth. English barons passed their estates to their sons as a matter of legal right. Ottoman officials passed their positions (sometimes) and their wealth (rarely) only by special dispensation. They were not an aristocracy; they were a service class whose wealth depended on continued royal favor.

The Ayans were an exception—they had carved out de facto hereditary control over provincial resources. But their position was legally ambiguous. They were not supposed to exist. They had emerged from the breakdown of the timar system, not from recognized constitutional structures. This made them vulnerable: their de facto power had no de jure foundation.

Chapter 4: The Sultan Strikes Back

Mahmud II Learns to Wait

Sultan Mahmud II was seventeen years old when he witnessed Alemdar Mustafa Pasha blown to pieces by his own hand. He had nearly been murdered twice. He was surrounded by enemies: Janissaries who had killed his reformist uncle, Ayans who had just coerced him into signing away his prerogatives, religious conservatives who suspected any modernization.

He learned patience.

For nearly two decades, Mahmud II prepared his revenge. He could not move against the Janissaries until he had an alternative army. He could not move against the Ayans until he had crushed the Janissaries. He could not crush the Janissaries until he had built support among reformist bureaucrats and religious moderates.

He built his base quietly:

Religious Legitimacy: Mahmud cultivated relationships with progressive Ulema who supported reform. Unlike his uncle Selim III, who had alienated the religious establishment, Mahmud framed his eventual reforms as consistent with Islamic principles.

Alternative Military Force: Mahmud created new military units—artillery corps, trained engineers—that were not Janissary-dominated. He recruited from populations (Albanians, Arabs, Africans) without Janissary connections.

Divide and Conquer: He played Ayans against each other, supporting weaker lords against stronger ones, preventing the emergence of a unified provincial coalition.

Information Gathering: He built a network of informants throughout the empire, learning which officials could be trusted, which Ayans were overextended, which Janissary commanders were corruptible.

The Auspicious Incident (1826)

In June 1826, Mahmud II struck.

He announced the creation of a new military corps—the **Asakir-i Mansure-i Muhammediye** ("Victorious Soldiers of Muhammad")—trained in modern methods and explicitly intended to replace the Janissaries.

The Janissaries revolted, as expected. They overturned their soup cauldrons—the traditional signal of mutiny—and massed in the streets of Istanbul.

But Mahmud had prepared. His loyal artillery units surrounded the Janissary barracks. The Sultan obtained a fetwa (religious ruling) from the Sheikh ul-Islam declaring the Janissaries rebels against Islam. The bombardment began.

Thousands of Janissaries were killed in the initial assault. Thousands more were hunted down in the following weeks. The Janissary corps was abolished. Its property was confiscated. Its very name was erased from official records.

Ottoman historians called this the **Vaka-i Hayriye**—the "Auspicious Incident." Modern scholars call it a massacre.

With the Janissaries destroyed, Mahmud turned to the Ayans.

The Destruction of the Ayans

The Ayans had watched the Janissary destruction with mixed feelings. Many had been Janissary rivals. But they also recognized the implications: a Sultan who could massacre the Janissaries could massacre anyone.

Mahmud II moved methodically:

Ali Pasha of Ioannina (1822): Even before destroying the Janissaries, Mahmud had besieged this most powerful of Ayans. After a two-year siege, Ali Pasha was killed (legend says he was shot through the floor while hiding in a monastery). His head was sent to Istanbul. His vast domain was divided among appointed governors.

Tepedelenli Family: Ali Pasha's sons and relatives were systematically eliminated. Their property was confiscated. The family that had ruled northwestern Greece for generations was extinguished.

Danubian Ayans: The lords of Bulgaria and Romania—Alemdar Mustafa Pasha's successors—were picked off one by one. Some were executed for alleged treason. Others were transferred to distant provinces and then quietly eliminated. Their lands reverted to the state.

Anatolian Notables: The Ayans of Anatolia, less powerful than their Balkan counterparts, were more easily subdued. Mahmud replaced them with appointed officials (müdirs) who served at sultanic pleasure.

By 1839, when Mahmud II died, the Ayans were gone. The men who had forced him to sign the Sened-i Ittifak, who had briefly held constitutional leverage over the Ottoman state, had been physically liquidated. Their lands had been confiscated through musadara. Their families had been scattered or killed.

The Sened-i Ittifak was never formally repealed. It was simply ignored—a dead letter signed by dead men, with no living enforcers.

What Mahmud Built

In place of the Ayans, Mahmud II built a centralized bureaucratic state:

Appointed Governors: Provinces were ruled by officials appointed from Istanbul, serving at the Sultan's pleasure, rotated frequently to prevent local power accumulation.

Professional Army: The new military was loyal to the state, not to local commanders. Officers were trained in Istanbul; soldiers were recruited from throughout the empire; promotion depended on merit and loyalty, not provincial connections.

Administrative Centralization: Tax collection was rationalized. Land registration was systematized. The intermediate layers—the Ayans, the tax farmers, the provincial strongmen—were eliminated.

This was not constitutional government. This was bureaucratic absolutism—efficient, modern, and unlimited by any constitutional check on sultanic power.

The reforms that the Ayans had feared, that Selim III had attempted, that had provoked the crisis of 1807-1808—those reforms succeeded under Mahmud II. But they succeeded through

autocratic power, not constitutional limitation. The Sultan became more absolute than ever, precisely because he had destroyed the only class capable of checking him.

Part II: The Legal Container

Chapter 5: God's Law vs. Man's Law

The English Legal Inheritance

To understand why English barons could become legislators and Ottoman Ayans could not, we must examine the fundamentally different conceptions of law in each civilization.

English law in 1215 was **Common Law**—a system built from accumulated custom, judicial precedent, and royal writs. It had no single founder, no sacred text, no divine origin. It was human law, made by humans, changeable by humans.

The sources of English Common Law were:

Custom: "Time immemorial" practices considered binding because they had always been done. These customs varied by locality but were collected and systematized by royal judges.

Precedent: Decisions by royal courts in previous cases. Judges were expected to follow prior rulings, creating a body of case law that grew organically over time.

Statute: Acts of the King in Parliament. By 1215, the principle was already emerging that certain laws required more than royal proclamation—they needed the counsel and consent of the realm's magnates.

Royal Writ: The king's written commands, which initiated legal proceedings and defined the forms of action available to litigants.

The crucial point: **no one claimed this law was divine**. It was the law of England, not the law of God. It could be changed, amended, developed. The barons who demanded Magna Carta were not challenging divine authority; they were demanding that human law be applied fairly and that they have a voice in making it.

This opened the door to legislation. If law is human-made, then humans can make more of it. A body of nobles claiming legislative authority was not theologically absurd. Parliament—when it eventually emerged—was an extension of existing legal logic.

The Islamic Legal Framework

Islamic law rested on an entirely different foundation.

Sharia (literally "the path") was understood to be divine law—God's commands for how humans should live, revealed through the Quran and the example of the Prophet Muhammad. Unlike Common Law, which accumulated through human practice, Sharia existed eternally in the mind of God and was merely discovered, not created, by human interpreters.

The sources of Sharia were:

Quran: The literal word of God, revealed to Muhammad over 23 years. Every word was considered divine, inerrant, and eternally binding.

Sunna: The words and deeds of the Prophet Muhammad, recorded in collections of Hadith (traditions). Since Muhammad was guided by God, his example was normative for all Muslims.

Ijma: The consensus of qualified scholars. If the learned community agreed on an interpretation, that interpretation was considered correct.

Qiyas: Analogical reasoning, extending known rules to new situations by identifying shared principles.

Note what is absent: **human legislation**. No caliph, sultan, or assembly had authority to make new divine law. They could only interpret what God had already revealed. The role of the jurist (faqih) was not to create law but to discover it—to find God's command for each situation by careful analysis of the sources.

This created a profound structural limitation: **there could be no legislature in the modern sense, because God was the only Legislator**.

The Ulema: Guardians of God's Law

Who interpreted Sharia? The **Ulema**—the community of religious scholars who had mastered the Islamic sciences.

The Ulema were not priests. Islam has no priesthood, no sacraments requiring ordained intermediaries. But the Ulema held something equally powerful: **epistemic authority**. Only they had the training to interpret sacred texts correctly. Only they could issue fatwas (legal opinions) on complex matters. Only they could staff the Sharia courts that adjudicated personal and commercial disputes.

In the Ottoman Empire, the Ulema were organized into a hierarchy:

Sheikh ul-Islam: The chief religious authority, appointed by the Sultan but commanding independent legitimacy. His fatwas on major questions were considered binding.

Kazaskers: Chief judges for Rumelia (the Balkans) and Anatolia, overseeing the court system.

Kadis: Local judges who staffed Sharia courts throughout the empire, handling marriage, divorce, inheritance, commercial disputes, and minor criminal matters.

Muftis: Scholars authorized to issue fatwas—legal opinions—on questions brought to them.

Müderris: Teachers in the medreses (religious schools) who trained the next generation of scholars.

This was an entirely separate hierarchy from the military-administrative elite. The Ulema were recruited through education, not birth or military service. They had their own career paths, their own sources of income (religious endowments, court fees), their own institutional networks.

Crucially, the Ulema had **no interest in Ayan power**. The Ayans were provincial warlords—military men who had seized de facto control over tax collection and local administration. They were not scholars. They had no standing in the religious hierarchy. An Ayan assembly making laws would have been an affront to Ulema authority.

When the Sened-i Ittifak was signed, the Sheikh ul-Islam endorsed it—but as a political settlement, not as legislation. It was a contract between the Sultan and the Ayans, witnessed by the religious establishment. It did not create new law. It did not establish a legislative body. It merely documented a temporary political arrangement.

Kanun: The Sultan's Administrative Space

If Sharia was divine and unchangeable, how did the Ottoman state function? How could sultans govern a vast empire if they couldn't make law?

The answer was **Kanun**—sultanic administrative regulation.

Kanun covered areas that Sharia did not directly address: taxation rates, land tenure, military organization, administrative procedures, criminal penalties beyond Sharia's specific provisions. In these areas, the Sultan had discretion—not to override divine law, but to fill in gaps and adapt to circumstances.

The relationship between Sharia and Kanun was theoretically clear: Kanun was subordinate. It could not contradict Sharia. A regulation that violated divine law was illegitimate. The Ulema retained authority to rule that a particular Kanun violated Sharia.

In practice, the boundary was blurry. The Ottoman state developed an elaborate Kanun tradition, codified under Suleiman the Magnificent (r. 1520-1566), covering matters that Sharia addressed only generally. The relationship was sometimes tense—sultans pushed boundaries; Ulema pushed back—but the theoretical framework remained: God's law was supreme; the Sultan's regulations were administrative conveniences.

The Sened-i Ittifak concerned itself primarily with Kanun matters: taxation, provincial administration, the relationship between center and periphery. The Ayans were not claiming authority over Sharia. They were demanding limits on the Sultan's Kanun power.

But this created a problem. The Ayans could not claim divine authority for their position. They were not interpreting Sharia; they were negotiating administrative arrangements. The Sultan could agree to such arrangements—and then revoke them. Unlike Magna Carta, which claimed to restore ancient liberties rooted in English custom and natural justice, the Sened-i Ittifak had no source of authority beyond the parties' agreement.

When one party (the Ayans) lost the power to enforce the agreement, the other party (the Sultan) was free to ignore it.

Chapter 6: The Property Problem

English Barons: Owners of Their Own Land

The English barons who confronted King John at Runnymede were **landowners**. Their estates were their property, held by feudal tenure from the Crown but legally theirs to pass to their heirs, manage as they saw fit, and defend against royal encroachment.

This seems obvious, but it was not universal. In many political systems, land belonged to the ruler, and nobles held it only at royal pleasure. The Ottoman Empire was such a system.

English property law had evolved through centuries of feudal practice:

Hereditary Tenure: A baron's son expected to inherit his father's lands. The king could demand a "relief" (inheritance tax), but he could not arbitrarily deny inheritance. This expectation was customary, enforceable in royal courts, and (after Magna Carta) explicitly protected.

Freedom from Confiscation: The king could not simply seize a baron's lands without legal process. He could declare a baron a traitor and confiscate his lands through judicial proceedings, but he could not simply take property at will. This was the "due process" that Magna Carta's Clause 39 would protect.

Economic Independence: Because barons owned their lands and collected their own revenues, they were not economically dependent on royal favor. A baron who displeased the king might lose access to court patronage, but he still had his estates. This economic independence enabled political resistance.

When English barons demanded constitutional limits on the king, they were defending property they already owned. They were not asking for new grants; they were protecting existing rights. And they had the economic resources—independent of royal favor—to sustain resistance.

Ottoman Officials: Trustees of the Sultan's Wealth

Ottoman officials—including the Ayans—operated under fundamentally different property rules.

The Timar System: The traditional Ottoman land grant was the timar—a conditional assignment of tax revenue from a specified territory. The sipahi (cavalryman) who held a timar did not own the land. He owned the right to collect taxes from it, contingent on military service. When he died, the timar reverted to the state for reassignment. There was no hereditary ownership.

Tax Farming (Iltizam): As the timar system decayed, it was replaced by tax farming. The government auctioned the right to collect taxes from a region. The highest bidder paid a lump sum upfront and then collected (and kept) whatever he could extract from the taxpayers. This was more like a commercial contract than a property right.

Musadara (Confiscation): Here was the crucial difference. Ottoman practice allowed—indeed expected—the confiscation of a deceased official's estate. When a vizier, pasha, or other high official died, his property was inventoried and seized by the treasury. His heirs might receive a portion, but only by special dispensation. The Sultan's gift at death was as important as his appointment in life.

This practice prevented the accumulation of hereditary wealth among the official class. Unlike English barons, who built up estates over generations, Ottoman officials knew their wealth was temporary. They might be spectacularly rich while in office, but that wealth would be seized upon death or dismissal.

The logic was deliberate: officials who could not pass wealth to their heirs could not build independent power bases. They remained dependent on sultanic favor. They could not become a hereditary aristocracy challenging royal power.

The Ayans' Ambiguous Position

The Ayans had partially escaped this system—which is why they were dangerous.

Through the decay of the timar system and the growth of tax farming, the Ayans had built up de facto hereditary control over provincial resources. They passed their positions to their sons, accumulated wealth that survived their deaths, and maintained private armies that gave them military independence from the center.

But their position was legally ambiguous. They were not supposed to exist. The Ottoman legal system had no category for hereditary provincial magnates. They were theoretically officials—appointed (or tolerated) by the state, removable at sultanic pleasure, subject to musadara upon death.

The Sened-i Ittifak attempted to regularize their position:

> "The Ayans of Rumelia and Anatolia, who hold authority in their respective territories, are confirmed in their positions. Their lands and property shall be secure."

This was revolutionary—it would have transformed de facto into de jure, making the Ayans a legally recognized hereditary aristocracy. It would have exempted them from musadara, making their wealth truly their own.

But the document had no enforcement mechanism. When Mahmud II grew strong enough to ignore it, he did—and then applied traditional Ottoman practice with a vengeance. The Ayans were not merely dismissed; they were destroyed. Their property was confiscated. Their families were scattered. The threat of hereditary aristocracy was eliminated.

Chapter 7: The Janissaries — A False Check

Praetorian Politics

If the Ayans failed to check sultanic power, what about the Janissaries? These elite slave-soldiers had deposed sultans, installed puppets, and shaped Ottoman politics for centuries. Weren't they a check on absolutism?

The Janissaries were the Ottoman Empire's most distinctive institution. Originally recruited through the devshirme—the "collection" of Christian boys from Balkan villages—they were raised as Muslims, trained as soldiers, and bound to the Sultan as slaves. They could not marry (initially), could not engage in trade (initially), could not bequeath their positions (initially). They were the Sultan's personal instrument.

Over centuries, these restrictions eroded. Janissaries married, traded, and passed their positions to their sons. They became a hereditary military caste, with corporate interests distinct from (and often opposed to) sultanic policy.

By the 18th century, the Janissaries had become:

A Political Force: They controlled Istanbul and could make or break sultans. At least a dozen sultans were deposed or murdered with Janissary involvement.

A Commercial Interest: Many Janissaries had become artisans and merchants, neglecting military duties while collecting military pay. They dominated certain guilds and opposed economic reforms that threatened their commercial privileges.

A Conservative Force: The Janissaries opposed military modernization (which would make them obsolete), fiscal reform (which would affect their pay), and administrative centralization (which would limit their autonomy).

Their method of political action was the **coup**—the sudden violent overthrow of a sultan or minister who displeased them. The symbol was the overturned soup cauldron: when Janissaries gathered in their barracks and turned over the cauldrons from which they ate communally, it meant rebellion.

Mob Rule vs. Constitutional Rule

The Janissaries were a check on power—but not a constitutional check. They illustrated the difference between **veto** and **legislation**.

The English barons at Runnymede demanded:

1. Limits on royal extraction (no taxation without consent)
2. Procedural protections (due process)
3. An institutional mechanism (baronial council) to enforce the limits
4. Recognition of their ongoing role in governance

The Janissaries demanded:

1. Maintenance of their privileges (pay, positions, exemptions)
2. Reversal of specific policies that threatened them
3. Sometimes, the head of a minister or sultan who had offended them
4. Return to the status quo ante

The Janissaries did not want to govern. They did not claim legislative authority. They did not propose constitutional structures. They wanted to veto changes they disliked—and then return to their barracks.

This was reactive, not constructive. The Janissaries could stop things; they could not build things. They could depose a modernizing sultan; they could not create an alternative governance structure. Their interventions were episodic (coups), not institutional (parliament).

Moreover, the Janissaries were compromised as defenders of broader interests. They defended their own privileges, not the rights of subjects generally. They opposed reforms that might have benefited the empire because those reforms threatened their position. They were a reactionary force, preserving obsolete arrangements rather than developing new constitutional settlements.

When Mahmud II destroyed the Janissaries in 1826, he eliminated the last internal check on sultanic power. But he did not eliminate constitutional government—because constitutional government had never existed. He eliminated a veto player, a potential source of coups, a threat to modernization. What remained was not less constitutional; it was simply more efficient absolutism.

The Contrast with Parliament

Compare the Janissary role to the English Parliament's development:

Feature	Janissaries	Parliament
Composition	Military caste	Landed/commercial elite
Authority	Force (coups)	Legal (legislation)
Continuity	Episodic interventions	Permanent institution
Goals	Preserve privileges	Expand power
Method	Veto	Legislation
Outcome	Reaction	Development

Parliament evolved from a consultative assembly into a legislative body with ongoing authority to make law, raise taxes, and check royal power. The Janissaries never evolved beyond a praetorian guard with coup capacity.

This difference was not accidental. Parliament could evolve because English legal culture permitted human legislation. The Janissaries could not evolve into a legislature because Islamic political theory reserved legislation for God.

Chapter 8: The Tanzimat — Reform Without Constitution

Mahmud II's Heirs

When Mahmud II died in 1839, his modernizing project continued under his sons Abdülmecid I (r. 1839-1861) and Abdülaziz (r. 1861-1876).

The **Tanzimat** ("Reorganization") era saw sweeping reforms:

Hatt-ı Şerif of Gülhane (1839): A reform edict promising security of life, honor, and property for all Ottoman subjects; fair and public trials; regular taxation.

Hatt-ı Hümayun (1856): Extended reforms, promising equality before the law regardless of religion—a revolutionary concept in a Muslim empire.

Legal Codification: The Mecelle (1869-1876), a codification of Islamic civil law in modern format, adaptable to contemporary commercial needs.

Administrative Modernization: Professional bureaucracy, provincial reorganization, secular education alongside religious schools.

The Constitution of 1876: Under pressure from reformers, Abdülhamid II promulgated an Ottoman constitution creating an elected parliament.

This looks like constitutional development. But notice what's missing: **the Ayans**.

The Tanzimat reforms were top-down—decreed by sultans, implemented by bureaucrats. There was no baronial class demanding limits on royal power. The Ayans had been destroyed. No alternative elite had emerged to check the sultanate.

The Constitution of 1876 created a parliament—the General Assembly—with an elected Chamber of Deputies and an appointed Senate. It looked like European constitutional monarchy. But it had no enforcement mechanism, no class of nobles with independent power bases, no legal tradition of human legislation.

When Abdülhamid II decided the experiment had failed (1878), he simply suspended the constitution and ruled as an autocrat for the next three decades. No one could stop him. The Assembly had no army. The bureaucracy served whoever held power. The Ulema cared about religious law, not parliamentary procedure.

The constitution was restored in 1908 by the Young Turk revolution—itself a military coup, not a constitutional movement. It was suspended again in 1920. The Ottoman Empire ended without ever achieving stable constitutional government.

What the Comparison Shows

The Tanzimat and post-Tanzimat reforms show what happens when modernization occurs without constitutional constraint.

In England, constitutional development preceded industrialization. Parliament existed before factories. The legal framework for limiting state power was established before the state acquired modern bureaucratic and military capacity.

In the Ottoman Empire, modernization and autocracy reinforced each other. Mahmud II destroyed the Ayans and built a modern army. His successors built a modern bureaucracy and expanded state capacity. Each increase in state power made constitutional limits harder to establish, because there was no class with independent resources to impose them.

The Sened-i Ittifak was the Ottoman Empire's last opportunity for constitutional development through elite self-defense. When Mahmud II destroyed the Ayans, he eliminated the only group capable of playing the role English barons had played. The modernizing reforms that followed made the empire more efficient—but they did not make it constitutional.

Part III: The Persian Shadow

Chapter 9: The Circle of Justice

Sassanian Statecraft

To fully understand why Ottoman political development diverged from English constitutional development, we must examine the deeper cultural inheritance: the **Sassanian Persian** tradition of statecraft.

The Sassanian Empire (224-651 CE) ruled Iran and Mesopotamia for four centuries before the Islamic conquest. When Arab armies overthrew the Sassanians, they inherited not just territory but administrative practices, court culture, and political philosophy. The Abbasid Caliphate (750-1258 CE) was profoundly Persianized; its bureaucracy, court ceremonial, and political theory were Sassanian with an Islamic veneer.

The Ottomans inherited this tradition through centuries of contact with Persian culture. The Ottoman court language included massive Persian borrowing. Ottoman poetry followed Persian forms. Ottoman political theory drew on Persian mirrors for princes. The men who administered the Ottoman Empire—the "Men of the Pen"—were trained in a tradition stretching back through the Abbasids to the Sassanian divan.

The central concept of this tradition was the **Circle of Justice** (Daire-i Adliye):

> "There can be no royal authority without the military; There can be no military without wealth; The subjects produce wealth; Justice preserves the subjects; Justice requires harmony in the world; The world is a garden, its walls are the state; The state is supported by the law; There is no law without royal authority."

This circle was closed: each element depended on every other. The king needed an army to rule; the army needed money; money came from productive subjects; subjects would be productive only if protected by justice; justice depended on good administration; good administration required a strong king.

What the Circle Excludes

The Circle of Justice appears benevolent—the ruler must be just, or the system collapses. But notice what's absent: **any check on royal power except the ruler's own prudence**.

The circle is not a contract. The subjects do not consent to taxation; they produce wealth, and the ruler takes it. The ruler should be just—but if he isn't, the only corrective is systemic collapse. There is no mechanism for subjects (or nobles) to enforce justice against an unjust king.

Compare English feudalism's (theoretically) contractual nature. The feudal relationship was a bargain: the lord provided protection and justice; the vassal provided service and loyalty; if either party failed, the other's obligations were released. Magna Carta's enforcement clause (61)

explicitly authorized barons to seize royal property if John violated the charter. This was contract logic—breach releases the other party.

The Circle of Justice has no such logic. The ruler owes justice to God, not to his subjects. If he is unjust, he sins—and God will punish him in the afterlife. But subjects have no right to resist. Rebellion against unjust rule is itself unjust; it breaks the circle and brings chaos.

The "Slave" System

Persian and Ottoman statecraft shared a distinctive institution: the recruitment of high officials from slave or non-elite backgrounds.

In the Abbasid system, the caliphs surrounded themselves with Turkish slave soldiers (mamluks) and later with Persian bureaucrats who—though nominally free—owed everything to caliphal patronage. These men had no independent power bases. Their families were not great houses with accumulated estates. They rose through service and fell through disfavor.

The Ottomans institutionalized this through the **devshirme** (collection) and the **kul** (slave) system. The Sultan's household was staffed by kuls—legally slaves, practically the empire's administrative elite. Grand viziers, provincial governors, military commanders—all were kuls, owned by the Sultan, their property subject to confiscation, their careers dependent entirely on sultanic favor.

This system was deliberately designed to prevent the emergence of a hereditary aristocracy. The English king faced barons whose families had held power for generations, who owned their estates independently, who could ally against the crown. The Ottoman sultan faced kuls who had no families (sometimes literally—devshirme recruits were forbidden to contact their Christian families of origin), no independent estates, no power except what the sultan granted.

This made the Ottoman state more powerful—no internal rivals could check the sultan. But it also made constitutional development impossible. Who would demand constitutional limits? The kuls owed their positions to the sultan; limiting sultanic power would limit their own authority. The Ulema cared about religious law, not administrative arrangements. The peasants were too dispersed and too weak.

Only the Ayans—who had escaped the kul system through the decay of the timar—had the position to demand constitutional limits. And they were destroyed.

Chapter 10: Why Some Elites Can Resist and Others Cannot

Structural Prerequisites for Constitutional Development

The comparison between England and the Ottoman Empire illuminates the structural prerequisites for the "elite self-defense" mechanism to produce constitutional government:

1. Private Property Independent of the State

English barons owned their estates. Ottoman officials held grants revocable at sultanic pleasure. Property independent of the state provides the economic foundation for political resistance. Without it, would-be constitutionalists have no resources to sustain opposition.

2. Legal Tradition Permitting Human Legislation

English Common Law recognized that humans made law and could change it. Islamic legal theory reserved legislation for God. Without a concept of human legislation, elite assemblies cannot become legislatures. They can negotiate contracts (like the Sened-i Ittifak) but cannot institutionalize legislative authority.

3. Institutional Continuity of the Elite Class

English baronial families persisted across generations, accumulating experience, connections, and collective identity. Ottoman officials rotated through positions, were prevented from building hereditary power, and faced musadara upon death. An elite class that cannot persist cannot develop institutional mechanisms for collective action.

4. Absence of Alternative Legitimacy-Holders

In England, the Church had its own institutional interests but no monopoly on law-interpretation. The English barons could claim legal authority without challenging religious doctrine. In the Ottoman Empire, the Ulema monopolized interpretation of God's law. Ayans who claimed legislative authority would have been challenging the Ulema's fundamental function.

5. Geographic Concentration and Communication

English barons were relatively concentrated and could coordinate. They met at court, communicated through messengers, and could assemble at short notice (as they did at Runnymede). Ottoman Ayans were scattered across a vast empire, from the Balkans to Anatolia to Arabia. Coordination was difficult; Alemdar's 1808 assembly was unprecedented and unsustainable.

Why These Factors Clustered

These factors were not independent. They clustered together because they emerged from common roots:

In England: Germanic tribal traditions (with their concept of customary law modifiable by the assembly), Roman legal inheritance (modified by local practice), and feudal organization

(creating layers of obligation) combined to produce an environment where constitutional development was possible.

In the Ottoman Empire: Sassanian bureaucratic tradition (with its Circle of Justice and slave officials), Islamic legal theory (with its divine legislation and scholarly interpretation), and steppe-derived military organization (with its fluid property rights and autocratic command) combined to produce an environment where constitutional development was structurally blocked.

Neither path was "natural" or "inevitable." Both represented specific historical configurations. But the configurations had path-dependent consequences: once the Ottoman system developed without a propertied aristocracy and with a religious monopoly on law, the structural prerequisites for elite self-defense constitutional development did not exist.

Chapter 11: Alternative Paths?

The Ayan Moment

The Sened-i Ittifak represented the Ottoman Empire's best chance for constitutional development through elite self-defense. The conditions briefly aligned:

- A weak sultan (Mahmud II, dependent on Ayan support)
- Powerful provincial lords (the Ayans, with armies and territories)
- A shared interest in limiting central extraction
- A document articulating constitutional principles

But the conditions did not hold:

- Alemdar Mustafa Pasha died within months, removing the Ayans' coordinator
- The Ayans had no mechanism for sustained collective action
- The legal framework did not permit them to become legislators
- Mahmud II systematically destroyed them once he consolidated power

Could it have been different? Perhaps. If Alemdar had survived, if he had institutionalized an Ayan assembly before his death, if the Ayans had developed ongoing mechanisms for coordination—the outcome might have differed. But "might have" is not history.

The Young Ottoman Moment

A generation later, the **Young Ottomans** (1860s-1870s) attempted another path to constitutional government—not through elite self-defense but through intellectual advocacy.

Writers like Namık Kemal and Ziya Pasha argued that Islam was compatible with constitutional government. They reinterpreted Islamic concepts (shura—consultation; bay'a—allegiance) as foundations for parliamentary rule. They advocated an elected assembly, limits on sultanic power, and rule of law.

Their advocacy contributed to the Constitution of 1876. But intellectual argument without social power produces weak constitutions. The Young Ottomans had no army, no provincial base, no economic resources independent of state patronage. When Abdülhamid II suspended the constitution, they could write pamphlets but could not resist.

The Young Turk Moment

The Young Turk Revolution of 1908 restored constitutional government—but through military coup, not constitutional development.

The Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) was an organization of military officers and bureaucrats who seized power, forced Abdülhamid to restore the constitution, and then dominated the government they had theoretically constrained.

This was praetorian politics, not constitutional politics. The CUP functioned more like the Janissaries than like the English Parliament—seizing power through force, governing without genuine accountability, and eventually leading the empire into World War I.

The result was neither absolutism nor constitutionalism but a hybrid: constitutional forms masking military oligarchy. The empire collapsed in 1918; its successor, the Republic of Turkey, would follow its own distinctive path—but not through the elite self-defense mechanism that had produced English constitutional government.

Chapter 12: The Broader Islamic Pattern

Beyond the Ottomans

The Ottoman case was not unique. Across the Islamic world, similar structural factors impeded constitutional development through elite self-defense:

Mamluk Egypt (1250-1517): The Mamluk sultanate was ruled by a slave-soldier elite. Mamluks were recruited as slaves, trained as warriors, and manumitted to serve the state. They held power—but they were not a hereditary aristocracy with property rights independent of the state. Their wealth was confiscated at death (a form of musadara). They could make coups but could not make constitutions.

Safavid Persia (1501-1736): The Safavid shahs ruled through a combination of tribal warriors (Qizilbash) and slave administrators (ghulams). Neither group could check royal power

constitutionally. The Qizilbash were military rivals to be managed; the ghulams were royal servants subject to confiscation. When Safavid power collapsed, it was replaced by chaos, then by new autocracies (Afsharids, Zands, Qajars)—not by constitutional government.

Mughal India (1526-1857): The Mughal Empire developed a system (mansabdari) where officials received ranks and associated income, but not permanent property rights. Nobles held their positions at imperial pleasure; their estates reverted to the crown at death. This prevented the emergence of a feudal aristocracy that could check royal power.

In each case, the structural factors that enabled English constitutional development were absent:

- No private property independent of the state
- No legal tradition permitting human legislation
- No institutional continuity of elite families
- Religious scholars holding the monopoly on legitimate interpretation

Was This "Islamic"?

The pattern raises a sensitive question: was the absence of constitutional development in the Islamic world due to Islam itself, or to other factors?

The answer is complex:

Not Islam Alone: The structural factors (slave elites, confiscatory practices, divine law monopoly) existed in other contexts. Byzantine and Chinese empires had similar patterns without Islam. The Persian Circle of Justice predated Islam.

But Islam Contributed: The Islamic concept that God alone legislates, and that scholars alone interpret God's law, created a specific barrier to secular legislative institutions. A "House of Lords" claiming legislative authority would have been theologically problematic in ways that it was not in Christian Europe (where the Church claimed spiritual authority but recognized secular legislation as legitimate in worldly matters).

Contingency Mattered: Different Islamic societies developed differently. Some (like Malay sultanates) had weaker central states and more pluralistic politics. The Ottoman pattern was not universal—but it was influential, and it did not produce constitutional development.

The most accurate statement: **Islamic political theory, combined with Persian administrative tradition and specific institutional developments (slave elites, confiscatory practices), created structural barriers to constitutional development through elite self-defense**. These barriers were not insurmountable—but they were not surmounted in the classical period, and by the time modernization came, it came through autocratic imitation of Europe rather than indigenous constitutional development.

Part IV: The Pattern as Finding

Chapter 13: What the Comparison Demonstrates

Two Documents, Two Outcomes

The juxtaposition of Magna Carta (1215) and the Sened-i Ittifak (1808) provides a natural experiment in constitutional development.

The Similarities:

Element	Magna Carta	Sened-i Ittifak
Trigger	Bankrupt king extracting from nobles	Weak sultan dependent on Ayans
Demanders	Landed barons with military power	Provincial lords with armies
Core Demand	No taxation without consent	Consultation before new taxes
Property Protection	Fixed reliefs; no arbitrary confiscation	Guaranteed land titles and positions
Enforcement Idea	Baronial council to check violations	Implicit mutual defense agreement
Document Type	Written charter	Written deed

The Differences:

Element	England	Ottoman Empire
Legal Framework	Common Law (human, customary)	Sharia/Kanun (divine/sultanic)
Property Rights	Hereditary, secure from confiscation	Subject to musadara
Elite Continuity	Families persisted across generations	Officials rotated, wealth confiscated
Alternative Interpreters	Church had limited legal role	Ulema monopolized interpretation

Outcome	Parliament developed over centuries	Document ignored; Ayans destroyed

The similarities show that the "elite self-defense" mechanism operated in both cases. The differences show why the mechanism produced constitutional development in England and failed in the Ottoman Empire.

The "Legal Container" Thesis

Gemini's original insight deserves formal statement:

The Elite Self-Defense Mechanism Requires a Legal Container That Permits Human Legislation

Constitutional development through elite self-defense requires:

1. A trigger (threatening monarch)
2. A capable elite (with resources to resist)
3. A demand (limits on royal power)
4. **A legal framework that permits the elite to become legislators**

The fourth element is crucial. English barons could claim legislative authority because English law was understood as human-made. Ottoman Ayans could not claim legislative authority because legislation was God's prerogative.

Without the legal container, elite self-defense produces contracts, not constitutions. Contracts bind only the parties who sign them; when one party gains power, the contract can be abandoned. Constitutions bind successors because they rest on a theory of legitimate government, not merely on temporary agreements between specific individuals.

The Sened-i Ittifak was a contract. Magna Carta became a constitution. The difference was not the documents themselves—they were remarkably similar—but the legal environments in which they existed.

The Institutional Prerequisite

Beyond the legal container, the comparison reveals a second requirement: **institutional continuity of the elite class**.

English barons were a hereditary aristocracy. They passed estates to their sons. They accumulated family traditions over generations. They developed collective institutions (the baronage as a recognizable class with shared interests and meeting places). This continuity enabled:

- Long-term strategic thinking (my grandson will benefit from limits I impose today)

- Institutional memory (we know what the king tried before; we know what worked to resist)
- Collective identity (we are the barons; we have rights as barons)
- Coordination mechanisms (we meet at court; we share information; we can assemble)

Ottoman officials—even the Ayans—lacked this continuity. The kul system deliberately prevented hereditary elite formation. Musadara seized wealth at death. Career officials rotated through positions. The Ayans were an anomaly—a group that had escaped the system's anti-aristocratic mechanisms—but they had only recently emerged and had not developed the institutional infrastructure for sustained collective action.

Alemdar Mustafa Pasha's assembly was the first time the Ayans had met collectively. It was also the last. There was no tradition of Ayan coordination, no institutional framework for ongoing consultation, no collective identity beyond shared regional interests. When Alemdar died, the assembly dissolved and never reconvened.

The Property Foundation

The third requirement: **private property independent of the state**.

English barons owned their estates. They could (and did) resist royal demands because they had resources the king could not simply take. Their economic independence enabled political independence.

Ottoman officials held positions at sultanic pleasure. Their wealth was legally subject to confiscation. They could not build up multi-generational fortunes that would provide resources for sustained resistance. The Ayans had achieved de facto hereditary control—but without de jure protection, this control could be reversed.

Mahmud II's destruction of the Ayans was legally straightforward. He was merely applying traditional Ottoman practice—musadara, confiscation, dismissal—to a group that had temporarily escaped such treatment. The Ayans had no legal defense; their position had always been irregular.

Constitutional development requires that the resisting elite have resources beyond royal reach. Otherwise, a patient ruler can simply wait, build strength, and then eliminate the resisters—as Mahmud II did.

Chapter 14: Implications for the Framework

Confirming the Elite Self-Defense Pattern

The Ottoman case confirms that elite self-defense is a **universal mechanism**. It is not culturally specific to England. Whenever a ruler threatens elite wealth through extractive policies, elites will attempt to limit royal power.

The mechanism appeared in:

- England (1215, 1688)
- Sweden (1718, 1809)
- Ottoman Empire (1808)

In each case: bankrupting ruler → threatened elite → demand for limits → constitutional document.

Identifying the Boundary Conditions

The Ottoman case also identifies the **boundary conditions** for the mechanism to produce constitutional development (as opposed to temporary truces followed by elite destruction):

1. **Legal framework permitting human legislation**: Present in England, absent in Ottoman Empire
2. **Private property independent of the state**: Present in England, absent in Ottoman Empire
3. **Institutional continuity of elite class**: Present in England, absent in Ottoman Empire
4. **No alternative monopolist on legal interpretation**: Present in England, absent in Ottoman Empire

Where all four conditions are present, elite self-defense can produce constitutional development. Where one or more is absent, the mechanism still operates—but it produces contracts rather than constitutions, and contracts can be repudiated when power shifts.

Revising the Narrative

The Ottoman case forces us to revise the triumphalist narrative of constitutional development.

The Whig Version: Freedom gradually expands; constitutional government is humanity's natural destiny; all societies will eventually achieve it.

The Structural Version: Constitutional government emerged in specific places (initially, parts of Western Europe) because specific conditions existed. Those conditions did not exist everywhere. Where they were absent, other political forms developed—bureaucratic absolutism, theocratic rule, recurring cycles of centralization and fragmentation.

The Ottoman Empire did not "fail" to develop constitutional government. It developed a different political form, suited to different structural conditions. That form—autocratic modernization—had its own logic and even its own successes (the Ottoman state survived for centuries; it modernized extensively in the 19th century; its successor states remain major regional powers).

But constitutional government, in the sense of institutionalized limits on rulers enforced by propertied elites, requires specific prerequisites. The Ottoman Empire did not have those prerequisites. The Sened-i Ittifak was a moment when constitutional development might have been possible—but the structural barriers were too strong.

Chapter 15: The Contemporary Inheritance

Why This History Matters

The comparison between England and the Ottoman Empire illuminates contemporary debates about democracy, constitutionalism, and political development.

The "Democracy Promotion" Problem: Western efforts to promote constitutional democracy often assume that the desire for freedom is universal and that removing obstacles (dictators, corruption) will allow democracy to flourish. The Ottoman case suggests otherwise. Constitutional development requires not just desire but structure—property rights, legal traditions, elite continuity. Where these are absent, removing dictators produces not democracy but chaos or new autocracies.

The "Islam and Democracy" Debate: Some argue that Islam is incompatible with democracy; others argue that Islam has its own democratic traditions (shura, bay'a). The Ottoman case suggests a more nuanced view. Islamic political theory did create specific barriers to legislative institutions—but those barriers were not absolute. The problem was not Islam alone but the combination of Islamic legal theory with Persian administrative tradition and specific Ottoman institutions. Different Islamic societies, with different configurations, might produce different outcomes.

The "Constitutional Transplant" Problem: Many countries have adopted Western-style constitutions—written documents, separation of powers, elected assemblies. These transplants often fail to produce constitutional government in practice. The Ottoman case shows why: constitutions are not just documents but require underlying structures (property rights, elite classes capable of resistance, legal traditions permitting human legislation). Without these structures, constitutional documents become dead letters, easily suspended or ignored.

The Long Shadow of Mahmud II

The destruction of the Ayans cast a long shadow.

When the Ottoman Empire collapsed in 1918-1922, it was replaced by nation-states (Turkey, Iraq, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, etc.) with no tradition of constitutional limits on executive power. The elites who might have demanded such limits had been destroyed a century earlier. The legal traditions that might have supported such limits had never developed.

Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, who founded the Republic of Turkey, was in many ways Mahmud II's heir. He pursued modernization through autocratic power, abolishing the caliphate, suppressing religious influence, and building a centralized secular state. His party (the Republican People's Party) dominated Turkish politics for decades. Genuine multi-party democracy emerged only in 1950—and has been repeatedly interrupted by military coups.

The broader Middle East has experienced similar patterns: cycles of autocracy, modernization, and instability, without the emergence of stable constitutional limits on executive power. The structural prerequisites identified in this study—private property independent of the state, legal traditions permitting human legislation, elite continuity, absence of alternative legitimacy-monopolists—remain largely absent.

This is not a prediction of permanent autocracy. Structures can change. New elites can emerge. Legal traditions can evolve. But change requires understanding the structural barriers—not merely hoping that freedom's natural appeal will overcome them.

Conclusion: The Gavel That Was Never Grasped

The Sened-i Ittifak failed not because Ottoman Ayans were less brave than English barons, or because Mahmud II was more ruthless than King John. It failed because the legal container was different.

English barons could become legislators because English law was human-made. Ottoman Ayans could not become legislators because legislation was God's prerogative. English barons had hereditary property the king could not simply seize. Ottoman officials held positions subject to confiscation. English baronial families persisted across generations, developing institutional capacity for collective action. Ottoman elites rotated through positions, prevented from building hereditary power.

The Sened-i Ittifak was a peace treaty between a weak sultan and powerful provincial lords. Magna Carta was also a peace treaty between a weak king and powerful barons. But Magna Carta could become the foundation of constitutional government because the legal and institutional infrastructure existed to give it meaning. The Sened-i Ittifak could not become that foundation because the infrastructure did not exist.

The gavel—the legislative authority that transforms elite self-defense into constitutional government—was available to English barons. It was never available to Ottoman Ayans. They could negotiate contracts; they could not make constitutions. They could win temporary truces; they could not build permanent institutions.

When Mahmud II grew strong enough, he tore up the contract and destroyed the contractors. The men who had briefly held constitutional leverage over the Ottoman state were physically liquidated. Their property was confiscated. Their families were scattered or killed.

And the Ottoman Empire continued—modernizing, reforming, eventually collapsing—but never achieving constitutional government through indigenous elite self-defense.

This is not a story of Eastern failure and Western success. It is a story of different structures producing different outcomes. The structures were not chosen; they evolved from centuries of distinct historical development. But they mattered. They shaped what was possible.

Understanding why the Ottoman Magna Carta failed illuminates both the achievement of constitutional government where it emerged and the barriers to its emergence where it did not. The elite self-defense mechanism is universal. Its translation into constitutional development is not.

The missing gavel was not a failure of will but a structural impossibility. And its absence shaped the political development of entire civilizations.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Ottoman

- Sened-i Ittifak (1808). Turkish text with translations.
- Hatt-ı Şerif of Gülhane (1839). Ottoman reform edict.
- Hatt-ı Hümayun (1856). Ottoman reform edict.
- Kanunname of Suleiman the Magnificent. Ottoman legal codification.

English

- Magna Carta (1215). Latin text with English translation.
- Bill of Rights (1689). Parliamentary Archives.

Secondary Sources: Ottoman Empire

- Shaw, Stanford J. and Ezel Kural Shaw. *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1976-1977).
- Findley, Carter V. *Turkey, Islam, Nationalism, and Modernity* (Yale, 2010).
- Zürcher, Erik J. *Turkey: A Modern History* (I.B. Tauris, 4th ed. 2017).
- Hanioglu, M. Şükrü. *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire* (Princeton, 2008).
- Ágoston, Gábor and Bruce Masters, eds. *Encyclopedia of the Ottoman Empire* (Facts on File, 2009).
- Quataert, Donald. *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922* (Cambridge, 2nd ed. 2005).
- Yaycıoğlu, Ali. *Partners of the Empire: The Crisis of the Ottoman Order in the Age of Revolutions* (Stanford, 2016). [Essential on the Ayans and Sened-i Ittifak]

- Salzmann, Ariel. *Tocqueville in the Ottoman Empire: Rival Paths to the Modern State* (Brill, 2004).

Secondary Sources: Islamic Law and Political Theory

- Hallaq, Wael. *An Introduction to Islamic Law* (Cambridge, 2009).
- Vikør, Knut S. *Between God and the Sultan: A History of Islamic Law* (Oxford, 2005).
- Crone, Patricia. *Medieval Islamic Political Thought* (Edinburgh, 2004).
- Black, Antony. *The History of Islamic Political Thought* (Routledge, 2nd ed. 2011).
- Feldman, Noah. *The Fall and Rise of the Islamic State* (Princeton, 2008).

Secondary Sources: Persian Tradition

- Mottahedeh, Roy. *Loyalty and Leadership in an Early Islamic Society* (Princeton, 1980).
- Darling, Linda. *A History of Social Justice and Political Power in the Middle East: The Circle of Justice from Mesopotamia to Globalization* (Routledge, 2013). [Essential on the Circle of Justice concept]
- Daryaee, Touraj. *Sasanian Persia: The Rise and Fall of an Empire* (I.B. Tauris, 2009).

Secondary Sources: Comparative

- Kuran, Timur. *The Long Divergence: How Islamic Law Held Back the Middle East* (Princeton, 2011).
- Van Creveld, Martin. *The Rise and Decline of the State* (Cambridge, 1999).
- Fukuyama, Francis. *The Origins of Political Order* (Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011).
- North, Douglass C., John Joseph Wallis, and Barry R. Weingast. *Violence and Social Orders* (Cambridge, 2009).

Secondary Sources: English Constitutional Development

- Holt, J.C. *Magna Carta* (Cambridge, 3rd ed. 2015).
- Carpenter, David. *Magna Carta* (Penguin, 2015).
- Harris, Tim. *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (Penguin, 2006).

END OF STUDY

This expanded study builds upon Gemini's comparative analysis of the Magna Carta and Sened-i Ittifak, applying the Version 2.0 Analytical Framework to examine why identical structural conditions—bankrupting rulers, powerful nobles, constitutional documents—produced opposite outcomes in England and the Ottoman Empire.

Copyright and Licensing

© 2025 Thomas J. Bryan

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.
To view a copy of this license, visit: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

You are free to:
- Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format
- Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material

Under the following terms:
- Attribution — You must give appropriate credit
- NonCommercial — You may not use the material for commercial purposes

This case study is part of the collection *Patterns of Power: Systematic Analysis of Elite Control Mechanisms Across Civilizations*